

## Ma'Ayn Johnson

---

**From:** Bill Jahn <billjahn@roadrunner.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 1, 2019 7:04 PM  
**To:** Ma'Ayn Johnson  
**Cc:** Mathieu, Jeff  
**Subject:** Fwd: RHNA Recommendation

Ma' Ayn, here's BBL's comments on RHNA methodology.  
Let me know if you have any questions.

Bill Jahn

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jeff Mathieu <[jmathieu@CITYBIGBEARLAKE.com](mailto:jmathieu@CITYBIGBEARLAKE.com)>  
**Date:** July 31, 2019 at 8:05:13 PM PDT  
**To:** Bill & MaryJo Jahn <[billjahn@roadrunner.com](mailto:billjahn@roadrunner.com)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: RHNA Recommendation

Bill - also we'd like to thank and acknowledge Ma'Ayn Johnson for her incredible outreach and assistance in the early stages of RHNA program development.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Jeff Mathieu <[jmathieu@CITYBIGBEARLAKE.com](mailto:jmathieu@CITYBIGBEARLAKE.com)>  
**Date:** July 31, 2019 at 5:17:35 PM PDT  
**To:** "[billjahn@roadrunner.com](mailto:billjahn@roadrunner.com)" <[billjahn@roadrunner.com](mailto:billjahn@roadrunner.com)>  
**Subject:** FW: RHNA Recommendation

Bill,

Jae Hill, our new Planning Director, provided me this quick assessment. In short, we believe **Option 3** is the recommended commitment we should pursue to achieve our desired housing production goals.

Jeff

Jeff Mathieu, City Manager  
City of Big Bear Lake  
39707 Big Bear Blvd (building)  
Post Office Box 10000 (mailing)  
Big Bear Lake, California 92315  
909.866.5832

---

I've evaluated the RHNA methodology provided by SCAG for the 2021-2029 horizon, as well as some **\*very draft\*** scenario numbers provided by SBCTA. For the sake of

discussion, this analysis is simplified... but all are adjusted based on a percentage share of population within High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) and adjusted for social equity factors to obtain desired numbers of low-income housing.

- Option 1 – Share of Regional Household Growth Projected Need + Existing Need.
- Option 2 – Regional Total Need from HCD Estimates
- Option 3 – Share of Regional Population Growth (Local Inputs)

Option 2 is the most favorable for Big Bear Lake from a perspective of minimal policy changes and achieving some low goals, as our extrapolated housing growth rates (205 units expected between 2021-2029) would accommodate the allocation with at least 37 units to spare. Given the incredibly low production of housing region-wide under this scenario, however, this methodology will likely not be adopted.

Option 3 conversely has us falling short by an estimated 87 units, while Option 1 has us short about 30 units, without adopting new policies to incentivize new housing.

	Existing Need	Total Projected Need	Total Allocation
Option 1	53	182	235
Option 2			168
Option 3			292

These numbers may also vary, based on demographic data sources and current housing stock data. For example, we know that there has been an underreporting of new units to SCAG for our “replacement” of 33 new market-rate units constructed, but those are not represented in the numbers from SBCTA and not included in the analysis below. [The allocation could drop by about 33 units based on that factor.]

**Recommendation:** Obviously there are political considerations and sensitivities that will weigh on the discussion and adoption, but I believe that Option 1 is acceptable, and Option 3 is laudable... and both methodologies for calculating are sound.

**Jae Hill, AICP, CFM**  
**Planning Director**

**City of Big Bear Lake**  
 Office: (909) 866-5831 x141  
[jhill@citybigbearlake.com](mailto:jhill@citybigbearlake.com)

**City of Big Bear Lake**  
 P.O. Box 10000  
 39707 Big Bear Blvd.  
 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315  
 Office: (909) 866-5831 x141  
[jhill@citybigbearlake.com](mailto:jhill@citybigbearlake.com)



